

### REMARKS

As an initial matter, applicant kindly asks that the Examiner update the attorney docket number to: **ACSG- 59046 (1873P)**.

Further, three sheets of drawings containing FIGS. 4, 5, 5A, 5B, 7, 8A, 8B, 9A, 9B, 10, 10A and 10B showing proposed corrections in red ink were enclosed for the Examiner's review in a Response dated August 21, 2003. Applicant is awaiting Examiner's approval of the proposed drawing corrections, and proposes to file formal replacement drawing sheets implementing the proposed drawing corrections.

In the current Response, claims 1-7, 12, 13, 15, 16 and 19 have been canceled. Claims 8-11, 14, 18, 20 and 21 have been amended to change the dependency of these claims. New claims 24-26 have been added. After entry of this amendment, claims 8-11, 14, 17, 18, and 20-26 will be pending. Applicant requests reconsideration of the application in view of the preceding amendments and the following remarks.

### ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicant is grateful for the Examiner's allowance of claims 22 and 23 and for the suggestion of allowable subject matter based on claims 2-7, 13 and 14. Applicant has added new independent claims 24-26, which should also be in condition for allowance. The Examiner stated that none of the prior art discloses a stent and a polymeric film or sheet or tube wrapped around the stent such that a first layer and an overlapping second layer are formed, where the stent comprises an outer surface having at least one or more raised triangles, spikes, and raised squares. Based on this statement and the indicated allowability of claim 22, new claims 24 (which claims raised triangles) and 25 (which

claims raised spikes) should also be allowable. Further, new claim 26, which claims raised squares, should also be allowable because of the Examiner's statement and the indicated allowability of claim 23.

#### SECTION 102 REJECTION

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 8, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Myers et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,925,075. This rejection is now moot because claims 1 and 12 have been canceled and claims 8 and 11 have been amended so that they now depend from allowable claim 22.

#### SECTION 103 REJECTIONS

The Examiner rejected claims 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Myers et al. in view of Tartaglia et al., US. Patent No. 5,637,113. This rejection is now moot because claims 9 and 10 have been amended so that they now depend from allowable claim 22.

The Examiner also rejected claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaster, U.S. Patent No. 4,441,215, in view of Myers et al. This rejection is moot because claim 15 has been canceled.

Further, the Examiner rejected claims 16, 17, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Myers et al. in view of Pinchuk, U.S. Patent No. 5,053,048. In response to this rejection, claims 16 and 19 have been canceled and claim 17 has been amended to depend from allowable claim 23, and claim 20 has been amended to depend from allowable claim 24.


The Examiner also rejected claims 18 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Myers et al. in view of Pinchuk in further view of Tartaglia et al. This rejection is moot because claim 18 has been amended to depend from allowable claim 23 and claim 21 has been amended to depend from allowable claim 24.

### CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are respectfully requested and allowance at an early date is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

FULWIDER PATTON LEE & UTECHT, LLP

By:   
Douglas R. Peterson  
Registration No. 53,458

Howard Hughes Center  
6060 Center Drive, Tenth Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90045  
Telephone: (310) 824-5555  
Facsimile: (310) 824-9696  
Customer No. 24201  
51927.1